



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,108	08/22/2003	Meir Rosenberg	022719-0045	8437
21125 7590 10/01/2007 NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST 155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD BOSTON, MA 02210-2604			EXAMINER NGUYEN, HUONG Q	
			ART UNIT 3736	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@nutter.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,108	ROSENBERG, MEIR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Helen Nguyen	3736	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3736

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the RCE filed 9/18/2007. Claims 1, 7-8, 22, and 29 are amended, overcoming the previous claim objections. Claim 2 is cancelled.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-33 remain pending.

Claim Objections

2. **Claim 6 and 16** are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding Claim 6, it is unclear how said flexible membrane is formed in the sidewall of the catheter. Rather, it is believed that said claim should recite "the opening is formed in the sidewall."

Regarding Claim 16, said claim seems to mistakenly recited the length in the range of 8 cm to 20 cm while it is disclosed in the specification that a length of 5 cm to 20 cm is desirable (p.6). The rejection below assumes the length of 5 cm to 20 cm. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claim 1, 3-4, 6, 8-10, 15, 17-18, 21-24, 28-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al (US Pat No. 5951497) in view of Goodin et al (US Pat No. 4928693).

Art Unit: 3736

5. In regard to **Claims 1, 22, and 29**, Wallace et al disclose a pressure sensor device best seen in Figure 16, comprising: an elongate catheter 310 including a plurality of fluid-entry ports 332a formed in a sidewall thereof and having a first lumen 332 adapted to accommodate fluid flow therethrough and in fluid communication with the plurality of fluid-entry ports formed in the elongate catheter; a second, separate, fluid-filled, fluid-impermeable, sealed lumen 330 extending between a distal flexible membrane 342 that is disposed across an opening formed in the catheter and is adapted to be exposed to an external pressure source (Col.17: 27-42), and a proximal pressure sensor 102 that is effective to measure pressure of the external pressure source in response to displacement of the pressure-sensitive component (Col.13: 48-60), best seen in Figure 5-6, wherein Wallace et al also disclose using said pressure sensor device having many application of uses such as intra-ventricularly and thus must be implanted within a patient's ventricle for direct pressure readings (Col.17: 10-17).

6. However, Wallace et al do not disclose said second lumen filled with an incompressible fluid. Goodin et al disclose an analogous pressure sensor device comprising a first 18 and second lumen 20, said second lumen filled with an incompressible fluid to enable effective transmission of pressure for accurate readings (Col.4: 19-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Wallace et al such that said second lumen is filled with an incompressible fluid as taught by Goodin et al as an equally as effective means to transmit the pressure and thus provide accurate pressure readings.

7. In regard to **Claims 3 and 23**, Wallace et al disclose the flexible membrane 342 is disposed at a distal end of the second lumen 330, best seen in Figure 16, and the pressure sensor 102 is coupled to a proximal end of the second lumen, best seen in Figure 5-6.

8. In regards to **Claim 4**, Wallace et al disclose the flexible membrane 342 includes a first surface in contact with fluid within the second lumen, and a second, opposed surface adapted to be exposed to an external pressure source, best seen in Figure 16.

9. In regard to **Claims 6, 24, and 30**, Wallace et al disclose the opening is formed in the sidewall of the catheter, best seen in Figure 16.

10. In regards to **Claim 9**, Wallace et al disclose the second lumen 330 contains a predetermined volume of fluid.

11. In regards to **Claim 10**, Wallace et al disclose the second lumen 330 is free of voids.

12. In regards to **Claim 15**, Wallace et al disclose the second lumen has a diameter that is less than a diameter of the first lumen (Col.4: 20-24).

13. In regards to **Claim 17**, Wallace et al disclose the catheter 310 has a compliance (Col.9: 2-5) that is less than a compliance of the flexible membrane 342 (Col.9: 55-62; Col.10: 16-31).

Art Unit: 3736

14. In regards to **Claim 18**, Wallace et al disclose the catheter 310 has a low compliance such that it is not susceptible to deformation as a result of exposure to the external pressure source (Col.9: 2-5).

15. In regard to **Claims 21 and 28**, Wallace et al disclose the flexible membrane 342 comprises a flexible sleeve that is formed around a distal end of the catheter and that is in fluid communication with the second lumen 330, best seen in Figure 16.

16. In regards to **Claim 8**, Wallace et al in combination with Goodin et al disclose the invention above but do not disclose the flexible membrane 342 formed of a material selected from the group consisting of polyurethane, silicone, and solvent-based polymer solutions. However, Wallace et al disclose do disclose that said flexible membrane is made of an elastomer (Col.9: 59-62) and that one example of an elastomer is polyurethane (Col.8: 65-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the flexible membrane of Wallace et al as modified by Goodin et al out of an elastomer such as polyurethane as taught by Wallace et al as an effective material for transmitting the pressure readings.

17. **Claims 7, 25, and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al and Goodin et al, further in view of Goldstein et al (US Pat No. 5899937).

18. Wallace et al in combination with Goodin et al disclose the flexible membrane 342 above but do not specify its compliance. Goldstein et al teaches a pulsatile flow

Art Unit: 3736

system with a device comprising a membrane with adjustable compliance capable of duplicating a compliance value of $0.008 \text{ cm}^3/\text{mmHg}$, which is the equivalent of $8\mu\text{L}/\text{mmHg}$ (column 10, lines 25-38), instead of a flexible membrane with a compliance in the range of $0.05\mu\text{L}/\text{mmHg}$ to $2\mu\text{L}/\text{mmHg}$ as disclosed by the applicant. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a flexible membrane with a compliance of $8\mu\text{L}/\text{mmHg}$ because Applicant has not disclosed that a membrane with a compliance in the range of $0.05\mu\text{L}/\text{mmHg}$ to $2\mu\text{L}/\text{mmHg}$ provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Goldstein et al.'s membrane and the Applicant's invention, to perform equally well with either the compliance as taught by Goldstein or the claimed membrane compliance of $0.05\mu\text{L}/\text{mmHg}$ to $2\mu\text{L}/\text{mmHg}$ because both would perform the same function of causing a shift in equilibrium, with little force, and transferring the pressure signal to the sensor.

19. **Claim 14** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al and Goodin et al, further in view of Sgourakes (US Pat No. 4638656).

20. Wallace et al in combination with Goodin et al disclose the fluid in the second lumen 330 above but do not disclose its kinematic viscosity. Sgourakes teaches a differential pressure transmitter 20 comprising a first and second lumen, 22 and 24, fluid-filled region 50, and flexible membranes 42 and 44. The viscosity of the fill-liquid in the fluid filled region 50 is 5 cs (column 4, lines 40-45) for the purpose of pressure detection. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 3736

the invention to modify the invention of Wallace et al as modified by Goodin et al such that the fluid in the second lumen has a viscosity of 5 cs as taught by Sgourakes to provide a fluid that accurately detects pressure.

21. **Claims 11, 13, 16, 19, 26-27, and 32-33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al and Goodin et al, further in view of Brockway et al (US Pat No. 4846191).

22. In regard to **Claims 11 and 16**, Wallace et al in combination with Goodin et al disclose the second lumen 330 above but do not disclose the volume of fluid in said lumen nor the dimensions of diameter or length. Brockway et al disclose an analogous pressure sensor device comprising a lumen having a diameter in the range of about 0.1 mm to 0.3 mm and a length in the range of about 5 cm to 20 cm (Col.6: 13-16). From these dimensions, Brockway et al teach that the lumen is capable of holding 3 μ L of fluid, which in the range of about 1 μ L to 10 μ L. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the diameter and length of the second lumen of Wallace et al as modified by Goodin et al in the range of about 0.1 mm to 0.3 mm and 5 cm to 20 cm respectively, such that the volume of fluid contained is in the range of about 1 μ L to 10 μ L as taught by Brockway et al, as effective dimensions for the desired use.

23. In regard to **Claims 13, 26, and 32**, Wallace et al in combination with Goodin et al disclose the fluid in the second lumen 330 above but do not disclose said fluid as

Art Unit: 3736

biocompatible and with a low viscosity. It is noted that Goodin et al teach the fluid is saline which is known to possess low viscosity (Col.4: 19-24). Brockway et al disclose an analogous pressure sensor device comprising a lumen 28 filled with a biocompatible low viscosity fluid 29 to effectively obtain pressure readings (Col.5: 24-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the fluid in the second lumen of Wallace et al as modified by Goodin et al to be biocompatible and have a low viscosity as an effective means to transmit the pressure for accurate readings and prevent harmful reactivity with the body in case of leakage respectively.

24. In regard to **Claims 19, 27, and 33**, Wallace et al in combination with Goodin et al disclose the pressure sensor 102 above but do not disclose the sensor having a frequency response that is greater than 20 Hz. Brockway et al disclose an analogous pressure sensor device with a pressure sensor having a frequency response at greater than 20 Hz (Col.6: 30-37) as an effective response frequency for measuring pressure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the pressure sensor of Wallace et al as modified by Goodin et al have a frequency response that is greater than 20 Hz as taught by Brockway et al as an effective response frequency for measuring pressure.

25. **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al and Goodin et al, further in view of Cosman (US Pat No. 4385636).

Art Unit: 3736

26. Wallace et al in combination with Goodin et al disclose the second lumen 330 with fluid above, wherein Goodin et al disclose the fluid is saline which is known to possess low viscosity (Col.4: 19-24, but do not disclose the fluid is silicone fluid. Cosman teaches that silicone fluid is effectively used to transmit pressure (Col.14: 18-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the low viscosity fluid of Wallace et al as modified by Goodin et al to be a silicone fluid as taught by Cosman as an effective fluid to transmit pressure for accurate readings.

27. **Claim 20** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al and Goodin et al, further in view of Mann et al (US Pat No. 20040167580).

28. Wallace et al in combination with Goodin et al disclose the pressure sensor 102 above but do not disclose the range of compliance of said sensor. Mann et al teach that a pressure sensor with a low compliance is desirable to prevent errors in sensed pressure readings (§0156) but do not explicitly state a value for said compliance. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the pressure sensor with a compliance in the range of about 0.1 μ L/mmHg to 0.02 μ L/mmHg because Applicant has not disclosed that a pressure sensor with such a specific compliance provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem, other than that a low compliance is desirable just as Mann et al teach. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected the pressure sensor of Mann et al and the Applicant's invention, to perform equally well in the function of pressure sensing as both disclose measuring

Art Unit: 3736

pressure with a sensor of low compliance. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the pressure sensor of Wallace et al as modified by Goodin et al to have a low compliance as taught by Mann et al, such as the range of 0.1 μ L/mmHg to 0.02 μ L/mmHg.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-4, and 6-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-8340. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on 571-272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3736

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HQN
9/21/2007

JEN

Max F. Hindenburg
MAX F. HINDENBURG
PATENT EXAMINER
EBC CENTER 3700